REMARKS

The above amendment and these remarks are filed in response to the Office Action of 14 Jan 2005.

Examiner Interview

Applicants' attorney expresses appreciation for courtesy extended by Examiner Raquel Alvarez in a telephone interview on 9 Mar 2005.

In that interview, applicants inquired as to the status of claims 23, 40, and 41 which in Paragraph 6 of the Office Action were designated as allowed, under the heading "Allowable Subject Matter", and in Paragraphs 3 and 4 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. The Examiner indicated that claims 23, 40, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, and suggested that applicants amend the claims to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101.

35 U.S.C. 101

END9 1995 0140 US2

16

Claims 1-21, 23, 26, and 40-41 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 in paragraph 3 of the Office Action as directed to non-statutory subject matter and in paragraph 4 of the Office Action as having no practical application.

Applicants have canceled claims 1-21, and 26, and have amended claims 23, 40, and 41 as suggested by the Examiner so as to recite structural limitations and so as to produce a useful, practical, and tangible result.

35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-7, 9-21, 26 and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Applicants have canceled these claims without prejudice.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 23, 40, and 41 had been indicated as allowed, which applicants interpret to mean that they contain allowable subject matter and would be allowed upon amending

END9 1995 0140 US2

17

them to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Applicants have amended claims 23, 40, and 41, as previously discussed with respect to 35 U.S.C. 101. Claims 23, 40, and 41 have not been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 or 103.

With respect to claims 23 and 41, the Examiner stated:

"...visually displaying in a display panel a navigation space and a plurality [in this case, three] of scrollable lists, a verb list and an attribute list [and a noun list] and responsive to a selection of two entries from two of said lists, highlighting in said navigation space a highlighted plane of points representing process tuples for all entries in the list not selected and response to selection of a highlighted point, in combination with the other limitations is not taught in the prior art of record." [Office Action, paragraph 6.]

With respect to claim 40, the Examiner states:

"...said customer selecting a said point to modify said

END9 1995 0140 US2

representation for the process represented by said point... by selectively adding, deleting and changing a set of expressions representing said attributes dimension, each said expression being capable of evaluation to a Boolean value, in combination with the other limitations of the claim is not taught in the prior art of record." [Office Action, paragraph 6.]

Applicants urge that claims 23, 40, and 41 as amended be allowed.

CONCLUSION

Applicants urge that the above amendment be entered and the case passed to issue with claims 23, 40, and 41.

The Application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, or if this Amendment is deemed Non-Compliant under 37 CFR 1.121, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number

END9 1995 0140 US2

provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707.02(j) and 707.03 in order that allowable claims can be presented in a compliant manner for examination on the merits, thereby placing the Application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Sincerely,

E. B. Boden, et al.

By

Shell by M Beckstrand Reg. No. 24,886

Date: 6 Apr 2005

Shelley M Beckstrand, P.C. Patent Attorney 61 Glenmont Road Woodlawn, VA 24381-1341

Phone: 276 238-1972